

## Checklist for Determining Progress of State NPS Management Programs in 2013

### Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ)

Completed by the US EPA Region 10, May 2014

Regions shall review the progress that each state is making in implementing its nonpoint source (NPS) management program and provide written documentation of this progress. Specifically, prior to awarding grants under section 319 funds, the regions should document the extent to which each state meets foundational aspects of program progress and 319 grant management. For this interim guidance the following approach applies. These aspects shall be assessed as a whole in making a determination, with each response constituting information, or a line of evidence, that will lead towards a decision based on the region's best professional judgment. Regions retain latitude for how each checklist response is weighted and have the flexibility to incorporate additional considerations in their determinations; negative responses to a questions may be supplemented with a justification or description of a corrective action underway or necessary.

The final determination of progress of state NPS management programs is to be made by the Regional Administrator or delegated authority (e.g. water division director or program manager). The checklist for this determination should be completed by the appropriate regional NPS program staff (typically, the CWA section 319 Grant Program Officer for non—PPG awards and the CWA section 319 NPS Program Coordinator for states that include section 319 grant funds in a PPG).

#### **1. Meeting Statutory and Regulatory Requirements and Demonstrating Water Quality Results**

Section 319(h) (8) requires EPA to determine if a state has made satisfactory progress in meeting a schedule of annual milestones to implement its NPS management program.

- i) Does the state's NPS management program include relevant, up-to-date and trackable annual milestones for program implementation? Yes
- ii) If the state does not yet include up-to-date annual milestones in its NPS management program, in what document(s) is this schedule located?
- iii) Has the state reported its progress in the annual report required under CWA section 319(h)(11) in meeting its milestone(s) for the preceding fiscal year? Yes
- iv) Has the state demonstrated satisfactory progress in meeting its schedule or milestone(s) for the preceding fiscal year? Briefly elaborate. (If no, in accordance with CWA section 319(h)(8), the 319 grant award for the coming year cannot be awarded)

B. Section 319(h)(11) requires each state to report on an annual basis reductions in NPS pollutant loading and improvements in water quality.

- i) For all active projects that have NPS reduction goals for nutrients or sediment, did the state report load reductions (WQ-9) into GRTS during the reporting period after the first year that practices were installed or implemented achieved?

Annual nitrogen, phosphorus and sedimentation-siltation reductions from 319 FY 2013 were

modeled and entered into GRTS by ODEQ. Two projects were summarized in Table 12 (page 62) in the Annual Report. The load reductions estimates for these two projects for 2013 totaled 517,291 pounds/year for Nitrogen, 112,438 pounds/year and 18,005 tons/year for sediments-siltation.

ii) Has the state reported improvements in water quality that have occurred in the current reporting period resulting from implementation of its NPS management program and/or previous years' section 319(h) grant work plans? (e.g., reporting on SP-12 or other improvements such as shellfish bed and beach openings that have not yet led to attainment of water quality standards)?

Not applicable (as specific target goal).

iii) Did the state meet its annual commitment/target/goal (if any) under WQ-10 to remove impaired waters from the 303(d) list? Although there is no state-specific target, the Oregon DEQ/EPA PPG includes a commitment to prepare Success Stories documenting either water quality progress or water quality restoration/attainment (WQ-10).

Oregon has one WQ-10 story, Diamond Lake, and two additional 'showing progress' Success Stories for Oregon (Bear Creek Lake and Tualatin River) have been completed and posted on the EPA Success Story website.

## **2. Overall GRTS Reporting**

For this question, it is sufficient to report on the results of previously conducted post-award grants monitoring. No additional monitoring may be needed.

- A. To ensure that the state meets the reporting requirements in section 319(h)(11), did the state enter all mandated data elements into GRTS (including geolocational tags where available) for all applicable projects in the previous section 319 grant award?

Yes

## **3. Focus on Watershed-Based Implementation**

For this question, it is sufficient to document the results of previous findings, if this was determined during the Region's reviews of the state's active grant work plans. **Appendix E – Continued**

72

- A. Is the state implementing nine-element watershed-based plans – or approved alternative plans - at required grant expenditure levels in accordance with EPA's guidelines for CWA section 319(h) grants? That is, in fiscal year 2014 and subsequent years, was 50% of the state's grant used to implement watershed based plans, unless the state provided state funding for watershed projects equal to its total section 319 allocation? If no, please explain.

No – Oregon does direct at least 80% of its 319 incremental funds (going into both the categorical 319 grants and into their PPG) to local implementation project subgrants, and to NPS and TMDL program staff activities which support TMDL and watershed-based plan integration and implementation in impaired waters. EPA continued to work with Oregon to incorporate the nine key watershed based plan elements into the state TMDL implementation planning process involving the state designated management agencies. EPA Region 10 reviewed and approved all Oregon 319 project workplans.

## **4. Ensuring Fiscal Accountability**

For this section, it is sufficient to briefly report on the results of previously conducted grants management and oversight required of all grants.

A. *Tracking and Reporting*. For all active section 319(h) grants, using existing post-award monitoring or best professional judgment:

- i) Is the state's RFP process efficient and timely for selecting and funding projects within the work plan timeframe?

Yes

- ii) Did the State obligate all of the section 319(h) funds in the previous year's award within one year per current section 319 grant guidelines?

Yes, the current annual report for 2013 covers calendar year 2013. The funds are available as specified in 319(b)(6).

B. *Rate of Expenditures*. For categorical grants, include and examine a summary of expenditures for all open section 319 grant awards listing the following: state; grant #; FY; project period; grant award amount; balance (unliquidated obligation); percent unliquidated obligation. See example below, which contains information readily available through Compass, EPA's financial data warehouse. This information could also be obtained from other EPA tools such as GRTS or the Post Award Baseline Tracking Tool. Include a state total of grant award amount, balance and percent unliquidated obligation. Please reference the source and date of information used to answer the question below. ("SA" in column 1 of the example below = State Abbreviation.)

*Note: This analysis is not required for section 319 funds incorporated into a PPG. CWA*  
Section 319(h) Funds, Rates of Expenditures (Unliquidated Obligations)

Oregon DEQ-CWA 319 Grant Balances (Unliquidated Obligations)

Based on Compass Federal Data Warehouse Online as of May 13, 2014

	Grant #	FY	Project Period	Grant Award Amount	Balance (ULO)	Ba
O R	C900045109	0 9	05/01/09-12/31/13	\$1,687,109	0	0
O R	C900045110	1 0	06/01/10-12/31/14	\$1,381,409	\$98,491	
O R	C900045111	1 1	07/01/11-12/31/14	\$1,111,832	\$222,567	
O R	C900045112	1 2	06/01/12-12/31/15	\$905,000	\$548,284	
O R	BG00J56501	1 2	07/01/12-06/30/14	\$1,248,951 (PPG)		
O R	C900045113	1 3				

Relying on best professional judgment, do the figures in the Rate of Expenditures chart substantially match the expected drawdown rates or the negotiated outlay strategy from the associated grant work plan schedules? If not, briefly explain.

## **5. PPG Considerations**

For states that include section 319 funds in Performance Partnership Grants (PPGs), briefly report on the following.

A. Has the state followed the goals, objectives and measures of the national program guidelines and priorities in implementing its NPS program? If not, did the state negotiate with the EPA region a work plan that differs significantly from the National Program Manager (NPM) guidance? (If yes, the EPA Region was required to consult with the NPS NPM.) Please explain.

B. Using best professional judgment, has the state adequately documented progress consistent with its listed priorities?

## **6. Identifying and Addressing Performance Issues/Progress Concerns**

A. Considering issues itemized on this checklist, briefly summarize any significant outstanding section 319 grant performance issues or progress concerns, including recommendation(s) for corrective action(s). For states with out-of-date NPS management programs or schedule of milestones, Regions are to ensure that forthcoming section 319 grant awards are contingent on completing updates to these programs or milestones.

B. Are there other significant outstanding section 319 grant performance issues or progress concerns that were not identified through this checklist? If so, please describe, including any recommendation(s) for corrective action(s), as may be appropriate.